

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-20, and 22-27 are currently pending. Claim 1 has been amended. New matter has not been added with the amendments to the claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-20, and 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,745,238 B1 to Giljum et al. (“Giljum”). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over Giljum.

Claim 1 recites “receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate to a particular location within the web environment, wherein the request to publish content is received in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location.” Giljum teaches a screen for adding items, such as files, to a user’s folder (Giljum, column 13, lines 1-3, 52-54, column 14, lines 22-27). Giljum teaches that a Web Site Database includes item display options that allow a user to select where the item will be located on a rendered web page (Giljum, column 13, lines 56-59). Giljum also teaches that the web page includes areas for “regular items” and that the regular items are displayed under a category banner grouped by category. Allowing a user to add items, such as regular items, to a regular item section of a web page is not the same as receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate to a particular location within the web environment, where the request to publish content is received in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location.

The Office Action states that this feature is taught at FIGS. 9, 12, 13, and 15 and col. 13, lines 55-60, of Giljum by teaching that Giljum teaches that a user requests to navigate to a particular location to add an item via the “Add Item” button and upon selection of this button, the particular location “Regular Items” is displayed to visually aid the user as to the actual placement of the new item. However, allowing a user to add items via an “Add Item” button is not a request to navigate to a particular location within a web environment. Furthermore, publishing a

newly added item at a particular location, as taught by Giljum, is not the same as receiving the request to publish content in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface. Accordingly, since Giljum fails to teach each and every feature of claim 1, claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited reference.

Claim 14 recites, in part, “wherein the library of components includes predefined components defined in different languages” and “the generated web environment including components specified by the parameters and allowing a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment.” Giljum does not teach or suggest this feature and the Office Action agrees (Office Action, page 6). Accordingly, claim 14 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited reference.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 14-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giljum and U.S. Patent No. 7,234,110 B2 to Sumitomo (“Sumitomo”). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited art.

Claim 14 recites “present[ing] a user interface adapted to allow a user to configure parameters relating to a set of predefined components for a web environment”, “wherein the library of components includes predefined components defined in different languages” and “the generated web environment including components specified by the parameters and allowing a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment.”

Giljum does not teach or suggest this feature and the Office Action agrees (Office Action, page 6). Sumitomo fails to rectify the deficiencies of Giljum.

The Office Action states that this feature is taught at column 5, lines 1-6 and 25-29, and column 6, lines 32-63 of Sumitomo by teaching predefined components in different languages where a user can request to selectively switch languages. However, the cited portions of Sumitomo teach storing dynamic pages corresponding to a plurality of languages. Storing a page in a variety of different languages is not the same as storing predefined components in different

languages, where a user interface allows a user to configure parameters relating to a set of predefined components for a web environment and where the generated web environment includes components specified by the parameters. Thus, Sumitomo fails to teach a library of components that includes predefined components defined in different languages to allow a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment. Instead, Sumitomo teaches storing the whole web page in a variety of languages.

The Office Action states that Giljum discloses predefined components and Sumitomo discloses predefining components in different languages and thus, the combination of references teach a library of components that includes predefined components defined in different languages to allow a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment. Applicant respectfully submits that this combination of references is not appropriate.

First, the Office Action fails to appropriately set forth the rationale for the combination of references based on the rationale that known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations (see Office Action, page 6 stating “[i]n the same field of endeavor, Sumitomo discloses...”). As clearly stated in “Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.”, Fed. Reg. 72:195 (Oct. 10, 2007) p. 57533, a finding under this rationale must clearly articulate the following:

- (1) a finding that the scope and content of the prior art, whether in the same field of endeavor as that of the applicant's invention or a different field of endeavor, included a similar or analogous device (method, or product);
- (2) a finding that there were design incentives or market forces which would have prompted adaptation of the known device (method, or product);
- (3) a finding that the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art were encompassed in known variations or in a principle known in the prior art;
- (4) a finding that one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the identified design incentives or other market forces, could have implemented the claimed variation of the prior art, and the claimed variation would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art; and
- (5) whatever additional findings based on the Graham factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.

(emphasis added).

The Office Action merely makes a conclusory statement that the combination is due to the references being in the same field of endeavor and fails to provide a rationale for the combination as required. Since the Office Action fails to adequately provide an appropriate rationale for the combination, it is not appropriate to combine Giljum and Sumitomo.

Even if the combination was appropriate, the combination of references fails to teach a library of components that includes predefined components defined in different languages to allow a user to selectively switch among the different languages for presentation in the generated web environment. Instead, Giljum teaches a Web Site Database that permits information sharing among users and where each user has a personal folder to which the user may add items and control access (Giljum, column 12, lines 51-63) and Sumitomo teaches storing dynamic pages corresponding to a plurality of languages. The combination of these teachings merely teaches a system where each user has a personal folder to which the user may add items and control access and where this whole dynamic page generated is stored in a plurality of languages. This is not the same as storing predefined components in different languages, where a user interface allows a user to configure parameters relating to a set of predefined components for a web environment and where the generated web environment includes components specified by the parameters. Thus, the combination of Giljum and Sumitomo fails to teach all the features of claim 14.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons previously mentioned, claim 14 and its corresponding dependent claims are further allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 17, 2008

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/
Elizabeth Philip Dahm
Reg. No. 51,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000
Dallas, TX 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945